

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-7, 10-29, 31-39, 41-53 and 56-60 were pending and presented for examination. In an Office Action dated March 27, 2008, all pending claims were rejected. In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and withdraw them.

### Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Sugiyama and Mastie

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 18, 23, 26-27, 35, 43 and 46-47 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,633,723 to Sugiyama, et al. (“Sugiyama”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,515,756 to Mastie (“Mastie”). This rejection is now traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A system for printing multimedia data, the system comprising:  
an interface for receiving multimedia data from at least one of a plurality of different types of peripheral devices;  
a multimedia processing system coupled to the interface to receive the multimedia data, the multimedia processing system for generating an electronic representation and a printable representation of the multimedia data;  
a formatting module for formatting the printable representation in a predefined format configured for a specific type of peripheral device providing the multimedia data, **wherein the formatting module generates the printable representation in a predefined video paper format responsive to receiving the multimedia data from a video recording device, and wherein the formatting module generates the printable representation in an audio paper format responsive to receiving the multimedia data from an audio recording device;**  
a first output device coupled to the formatting module, the first output device for printing the printable representation of the multimedia data to a printable tangible medium; and

a second output device coupled to the multimedia processing system, the second output system for electronically outputting the electronic representation of the multimedia data.

A system receives, formats, and outputs multimedia data from at least one of a plurality of different types of peripheral devices (e.g., a cell phone, a camcorder, a digital audio recorder, a portable meeting recorder, a fixed position meeting recorder, a head-mounted video camera, an office-based experience capture system, or a PC frame buffer). The printer formats a printable representation in a video paper format if the multimedia data is received from a video recording device, and formats the multimedia data in an audio paper format if the multimedia data is received from an audio recording device. Thus, useful printable representations of media can be printed from multiple different types of peripherals in a format configured for the specific type of peripheral device providing the multimedia data.

The claims, as amended, would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for at least the reasons below. Specifically, Sugiyama and Mastie fail, alone or in the suggested combination, to disclose or suggest at least one claim limitation; specifically, the cited references fail to disclose that the printable representation is formatted in “a predefined format configured for a specific type of peripheral device providing the multimedia data.” Sugiyama merely discloses a video printer that can receive a video signal 11 picked up by an electronic still camera or video camera (*see* Sugiyama col. 3, ll. 11-14). Mastie discloses printing documents in conventional formats according to “print attribute values” assigned to a print job. (*see* Mastie, col. 2 ll. 15-52). In both Mastie and Sugiyama, the **specific type of peripheral device providing the multimedia data does not** contribute to determining the formatting of the output. Instead, the format of the printed

output depends only on the *type of device outputting the multimedia* and not on **the specific type of peripheral device providing the multimedia**.

The Examiner argues that “it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use different formats for printing depending on the type of printer connected as a peripheral device.” (*see* Office Action, p. 3) However, the printer in Mastie and Sugiyama merely is *an output device* and is not a **peripheral device providing the multimedia data** to the system. Similarly, the Examiner argues that “a generated representation on a CRT monitor is different from a generated representation on a printed medium...” (*see* Office Action, p. 4). However, the monitor mentioned in Sugiyama also is *an output device* and is not a **peripheral device providing the multimedia data**, as claimed.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates in the rejection of several dependent claims that Wendelken discloses a video paper format. Office Action, p. 6. Although, Wendelken uses the term “video-paper,” this term refers to a “storage medium” for storing information computed by an ultrasound unit (*see* Wendelken col. 6, l. 34). Wendelken does not disclose a video paper format in the context of the claim as a whole, and considered in the context of the specification. *See* MPEP 2111.01 (meaning of words used in a claim is not construed in a “lexicographic vacuum, but in the context of the specification and drawings”). Therefore, the video paper mentioned in Wendelken is clearly distinct from the video paper format of the claimed invention.

Independent claim 35 recites a method for printing multimedia data and is patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as above.

New claim 70 recites, in relevant part:

“...a formatting module for formatting the printable representation in a predefined video paper format configured for a specific type of peripheral device providing the multimedia data...”

The claimed invention formats a printable representation in a predefined video paper configured for a specific type of peripheral device providing the multimedia data. For example, in one embodiment, multimedia data is received from a portable meeting recorder and the video paper format include at least one image showing each attendee of the meeting. In another example, multimedia data is received from a PC frame buffer and the video paper format includes images captured when the display of the PC changes significantly. Other examples are provided in paragraphs [0063]-[0071] of the specification.

None of the cited references disclose or suggest a video paper format comprising “formatting the printable representation a predefined video paper format configured for a specific type of peripheral device providing the multimedia data.” In both Mastie and Sugiyama, for example, the **specific type of peripheral device providing the multimedia data** does not contribute to determining the formatting of the output. Instead, the format of the printed output depends only on the *type of device outputting the multimedia* and not on **the specific type of peripheral device providing the multimedia**. In Hoda, only a playback system is described. Hoda is not directed to a system for generating the printed document, and thus does not disclose or suggest formatting in a predefined video paper format configured for a specific type of peripheral device providing the multimedia data. The remaining references also fail to disclose or suggest at least the above limitation. Therefore, new claim 70 is also patentable over the cited references.

In view of the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 35, and 70 are all patentable over the cited references taken

individually or in combination. The dependent claims incorporate all the limitations of their respective base claims and are also patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons above.

Claims 4-7, 10-29, 31-34, 36-39, 41-53 and 56-60

In the 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph of the Office Action, dependent claims 4-7, 10-29, 31-34, 36-39, 41-53 and 56-60 have further been rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama and Mastie in various combinations with U.S. Patent No. 6,193,658 B1 to Wendelkin; U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0220988 A1 to Hymel; U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0185533 A1 to Shieh; U.S. Patent No. 6,115,718 to Huberman; U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0010641 A1 to Stevens; U.S. Patent No. 5,436,792 to Leman; U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0048224 A1 to Dygert; U.S. Patent No. 5,568,406 to Gerber; U.S. Patent No. 4,881,135 to Heilweil; U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0169849 to Schroath; U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0051010 A1 to Jun, and U.S. Patent No. 4,831,610 to Hoda. These rejections are now traversed.

The claims each depend from an independent claim shown above to be patentable over Sugiyama and Mastie, alone or in the suggested combination. These claims also are patentable over the above list of cited references and combinations because none of the cited references, alone or in the suggested combinations, remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama and Mastie discussed above, nor does the Examiner argue that they do. Rather, the additional references are cited to show specific aspects of the dependent claims for which they are cited. Specifically, none of the cited references disclose or suggest:

“...a formatting module for formatting the printable representation in a predefined [video paper] format configured for the specific type of peripheral device providing the multimedia data....”

In addition, the dependent claims include additional features that are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants submit that the dependent claims are patentable over the cited references. Applicants thus request that Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

### **Conclusion**

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 4-7, 10-39, 41-57, 59, and 61-72 as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them. In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Jonathan J. Hull, et al.

Date: July 28, 2008

By: /Jason E. Amsel/

Jason E. Amsel, Patent Agent  
Registration No. 60,650  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: (650) 335-7692  
Fax: (650) 938-5200